

REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the final Office Action dated February 6, 2008, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-28 were previously pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 1 and 28 have been amended; and claims 5 and 6 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 7-28 are all the claims currently pending in the present application. No new matter has been added by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 28 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with written description requirements under U.S. patent law. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the limitation "...and transmitting the second upstream electrical signal to the host device through the optical fiber..." is not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one of ordinary skill in the art to make and/or use the invention. The Applicants have amended claim 28 to remove the phrase "...through the optical fiber...." Accordingly, withdrawal the rejection to claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, and 7-28 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwartz et al. (U.S. 6,801,767, hereafter "Schwartz") in view of Chuah et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,277, hereafter "Chuah").

The Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 28 to further distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art. Specifically, claim 1, in relevant part, recites the following:

"A wireless access system using Carrier Sense Multiple Access for Media Access Control of a host device using a plurality of terminals, the wireless access system comprising:
... an access control section for transmitting the downstream optical signal received from the master station to the plurality of slave stations via the optical fiber transmission line, and transmitting the upstream optical signal transmitted from the any one of the plurality of slave stations to the master station and to all other slave stations of the plurality of slave stations via the optical fiber transmission line."

The features noted above in independent claim 1 are similarly recited in independent claim 28. Specifically, claim 28 is a corresponding method having steps performed by the access control section of claim 1. Additionally, the above features are fully supported by the Applicants' disclosure (see, e.g., Fig 1).

In the Office Action, the Examiner relied on Schwartz in view of Chuah for disclosing or suggesting all the features recited in claims 1 and 28. However, the Applicants maintain that Schwartz in view of Chuah fails to disclose or suggest all the features of the access control section recited in claims 1 and 28, as amended.

Schwartz discloses a system for distributing multiband wireless communication signals. In the Office Action, the Examiner relied on col. 4, lines 10-22 of Schwartz for disclosing features of the access control section of claims 1 and 28. However, col. 4, lines 10-22 of Schwartz discloses an end-to-end gain calibration for setting a prescribed gain for downlink RF-groups. Specifically, a downlink gain control signal is detected at each remote unit and is used to maintain the gain for each of the downlink RF-groups at a prescribed level. As noted above, col. 4, lines 10-22 of Schwartz discloses, at best, that each remote unit (i.e., slave station) can detect a downstream signal. Nothing in col. 4, lines 10-22 of Schwartz discloses or suggests that an upstream optical signal is transmitted from any one of the plurality of slave stations to all other slave stations.

Thus, claims 1 and 28 (as amended) are distinguished over Schwartz. Additionally, Chuah fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Schwartz.

Specifically, Chuah discloses a method for controlling admission of remote hosts to a base station in a wireless communications network based on usage priority. In the Office Action, the Examiner relied on col. 9, lines 54-67; col. 10, lines 51-62; and col. 11, lines 12-25 of Chuah for disclosing features of the access control section of claims 1 and 28.

However, Chuah at col. 9, lines 54-67 describes an On-Demand Multiple Access Fair Queuing (ODMAFQ) scheme depicted in Fig. 22. As described in Chuah, remote hosts request access to a base station via a request access channel, and successful requests are sent to a scheduler. The scheduler then notifies remote hosts and wired hosts when it is their turn to

transmit. Thus, col. 9, lines 54-67 merely discloses that that a master station or device (i.e., the scheduler) notifies other slave stations (i.e., remote hosts) via a downstream optical signal that an access request has been made. Conversely, in the present invention (as recited in claims 1 and 28), an upstream optical signal is transmitted from any one of the plurality of slave stations to all other slave stations.

Chuah at col. 10, lines 51-62 discloses that an access point (AP) transmits to the remote hosts at a downlink frequency f1 while the remote hosts transmit to the AP at an uplink frequency f2. However, col. 10, lines 51-62 fails to disclose or suggest that an arbitrary remote host (i.e., slave station) notifies other remote hosts (i.e., slave stations) of any information using an uplink transmission.

Finally, Chuah at col. 11, lines 12-25 merely describes the contents of a broadcast message, and fails to disclose or suggest any upstream notification provided by a slave station.

Based on the above discussion, Schwartz in view of Chuah fails to disclose or suggest at least “transmitting the downstream optical signal received from the master station to the plurality of slave stations via the optical fiber transmission line, and transmitting the upstream optical signal transmitted from the any one of the plurality of slave stations to the master station and to all other slave stations of the plurality of slave stations via the optical fiber transmission line,” as recited in claim 1 and 28 (as amended).

Accordingly, no combination of Schwartz and Chuah would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 1 and 28 (as amended). Additionally, no combination of Schwartz and Chuah would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 2, 4 and 7-27 by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1.

In the Office Action, claims 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwartz in view of Chuah, and further in view of Chen et al. (U.S. 7,177, 294, hereafter “Chen”). As noted above, claims 5 and 6 have been canceled rendering this rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) to claims 5 and 6 moot.

In light of the above, the Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the Office Action dated February 6, 2008, and pass this application to issue. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tsutomu NIIHO et al.

By: /Mark D. Pratt/
Digitally signed by /Mark D. Pratt/
DN: cn=/Mark D. Pratt/, o, ou,
email=mlp@wenderoth.com, c=US
Date: 2008.05.06 15:48:58 -04'00'
Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP(MSH)/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
May 6, 2008